

REMARKS

Claim 37 is the only claim pending in this divisional application. By this response Claim 37 is amended.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of Claim 37 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,992,147 to Bolick et al.

The Examiner has also maintained the rejection to Claim 37 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,567,287 to Joshi et al.

Claim 37 has been amended. Support for the amendment can be found in original Claim 37 and paragraphs 131 and 132 of the application as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amended Claim 37 is novel over both the disclosures of Bolick and Joshi. It is settled that a § 102(b) rejection can be maintained only where the cited reference identically discloses all elements of the claimed invention. Applicants submit that the combination of elements now defined in the amended Claim 37 is not identically disclosed in either of the cited references, such that the amendments to the Claim avoid both rejections under § 102(b).

Withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejections and allowance of Claim 37 are therefore respectfully requested.

Since filing of a Response under § 1.113 does not itself stop the period of time for response to the final rejection from running, Applicants have also submitted herewith a Notice of Appeal to give the Examiner time to review the Response.

///

///

///

Should the Examiner believe that prosecution of this application might be expedited by discussion of any issues related thereto, a telephone call (collect) to the undersigned attorney for Applicants is cordially invited.

Respectfully submitted,



James W. McClain, Reg. No. 24,536
Attorney for Applicants

Date: February 15, 2005

Gordon & Rees LLP
101 W. Broadway, Suite 1600
San Diego, CA 92101

Phone: (619) 230-7454
Facsimile: (619) 696-6700

Attorney's Docket No. BFETH 1025793
(Formerly 6510-PA01D)
Client's Ref. No. 47938-40D

241158.1 021505